

...to dissent from opposing the reception of the memorial... but they have not wished the consequences. Their interests are so much involved in this, that they will not... say other abolition papers. The consequence may be awful. If we receive the paper, we may refer to it, and have a report upon it; and even if the report shall be unfavorable, the gentleman from Massachusetts, with his superior information, especially on all diplomatic subjects, may induce the House to reverse the decision of the report.

Why have we no petitions from the same quarter to recognize the independence of Texas? The petitioners are in direct contact with themselves on that subject. The very same persons urge us to put Texas under the ban. Is it any thing more necessary to show that this movement is part of the abolition scheme? The gentleman says that it is vain for us to refuse to recognize Hayti, because she is and will be independent, whether we recognize her or not; and emancipation will be declared in all the West India islands; that England has begun it; and that, lament who will, this is to happen. There will still be a question at our doors from which to attack the south. And I called to promote all this? Does the gentleman from Massachusetts expect me to aid him in such schemes? If he does, he will be woefully disappointed. All this goes to disturb our peace and endanger our safety. I lament it, and, lamenting, will resist. I will resist it to the last ditch. I will resist it at the threshold, and at every subsequent step, till arm and voice shall fail. Indeed! and because France was compelled to yield and recognize insurrectionary negroes who murdered her subjects at St. Domingo, are we, we of the south, to yield also? and not only to yield, but to aid those who would effect our destruction? That is the question now put to slaveholders in this House and out of it. I believe with the gentleman, that it is competent for this Government to treat for the recognition of a foreign Power, and that without regard to mere color; for we have recognized nations of a different color already, and more than once; but we stand in a different relation towards Hayti. This is the only body of men who have emancipated themselves by butchering their masters. They have long been free, I admit yet, if they had been free for centuries—if Time himself should confront me and shake his hoary locks, I would not say, I would not say to him, I owe more to my constituents, to the quiet of my people, than I can owe to moult prescription, however ancient—than I owe, or can owe, to all past acts whatever. Mr. GRENELL here moved an adjournment. And the House adjourned.—National Intelligencer.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Philanthropist.

MORE KIDNAPING.

DR. BAILEY.—A few days since, I called at a humble dwelling, the very outside of which bespoke the poverty within. As I entered, my attention was arrested by the disconsolate looks of a mother and two little children, one aged six years, and the other three. Their looks betrayed their wretched spirits. A few mornings since, they were seated around the table with the husband and father, cheerful and happy. But now, how changed! The husband went to his business, but he knew not that he left his wife and children, to see them no more! The day passed, and night came, but the sound of the footsteps of the laborer, returning to his home,—were not heard. The last stilling was spent, and the last stick of wood was consumed. Yet their wretchedness stayed not the "bony hand of poverty," neither did the pinching cold say, it is enough. The wife went in pursuit of her husband, and although found his employer, from whom she learned the blood-chilling news! He had not been removed by death. No! Had this been the case, she might have sought comfort with the thought that it was the affliction of a merciful Father who does all things well. But now she can adopt the language of a mother, (whose children had been torn from her embrace by a slave trader,) in reply to a woman who endeavored to console her by telling her that she had buried all of her children. "Ah!" said she, "If my children were only dead, I would not shed a tear."—she too could give my children, LIBERTY OR DEATH!"

Let those, who think Ohio ought to respond to the demands of Gov. Clark, read the following, and then say, whether the Legislature of this State should make it a penal offence to give a morsel of bread to a poor man, who has been crawling along behind fences for weeks, with hardly food enough to keep soul and body together, that he may breathe free air before he is gathered to his fathers.

Week before last, Alexander Johnson was taken from this city without a trial, and claimed as a runaway slave. This was the profound secrecy with which it was done, that it was very difficult to ascertain any thing about it. Johnson has been known here for 7 or 8 years. About 5 years ago he was employed by Mr. Rice of this city for whom he worked two years. Previous to this, he was employed by Hartwell and Lawrence. Mr. Rice says he was here five years without molestation. For some months past he has been living near Portsmouth, and about four weeks since, he came to this city on a provision boat. Thos. Barnes, the Pilot, got offended with Johnson while on his way, knocked him down, with an axe helve, and said, if he was in a slave state he would kill him. After they arrived here, Johnson assisted in unloading the boat, and in disposing of the apples and potatoes. A man from Ky. went to Barnes' Grocery, bought some apples and told Barnes to send them down to the ferry. Johnson was employed to carry them down. There was a company from Covington, headed by Mr. Grant, the Mayor, in readiness to receive him as soon as he stepped on board. Rev. Mr. Holmes, (I believe of this city,) and Mr. Gray of Covington saw Johnson taken and I have been told remonstrated against it.

Look at the facts that establish at least the probability that he was free. Barnes, by his own confession, was for a few weeks a slave driver; and as he was offended with Johnson, we may reasonably suppose he is not too good to do such dirty work. Besides, Barnes told one young man, that he was the cause of his being taken, and should probably get a part of the reward. (Though since there has been a little stir about it, he denies having had any agency in the matter.) Mr. Grant told me that Johnson was once arrested in Lebanon, this State, tried and acquitted. He said that he was acquitted, because the claimant could not prove him a slave for life. Others say, that he had been known longer in this State than he was represented as having been absent from his masters. Ben Smith, Jones and Knox, of this city, pursued him to Lebanon. Some or all that had an agency in arresting him at Lebanon, were held to bail for their appearance at court for attempting to kidnap.

Again, if he was a slave and could be proven to be one, why was it necessary to smuggle him across the river to a slave State? Have we no Constables in Cincinnati that will arrest "runaway human cattle"? Have we no Justices willing to deliver up fugitives? Our Kentucky neighbors must have forgotten the case of Frank Irwin, a free man of color, that was given up by a Justice of the Peace in this city. But there is a case for taking him to Covington for trial. The law of this State supposes every person free, until proved a slave; but the law of Kentucky presumes every colored man a slave, until he is proved free. And let me ask, what chance a man stands for proving himself free in a land of strangers, with no power to send for witnesses or affidavits? By the law of Kentucky, Johnson can be kept one year and one day in jail, waiting for his master, and if no one claims him, what then? Returned to his wife and children? No! SOLD TO PAY HIS JAIL FEES!

A. D. BARBER.

For the Philanthropist.

NEW SOCIETY.

Putnam County, O.

Pursuant to public notice, a meeting of the friends of immediate Emancipation, was held at the house of Jas. Turner, Pleasant township, Putnam county, Ohio, on Monday, Dec. 10, 1838. Meeting opened with prayer by Judge Macarty, of Findlay, Ohio. An address delivered by S. Guthrie. It was then resolved, to form an Anti-Slavery Society: Whereupon Jas. Turner, was appointed

President and S. Guthrie, Secretary of the meeting.

The following Constitution was then adopted. That part of the Constitution which is not of particular interest is omitted.

Art. 1st. This Society shall be called the Putnam County, Anti-Slavery Society.

Art. 5th. The object of this Society, shall be to promote by all laudable christian effort, the cause of immediate Emancipation of all the slaves of this land, and to this cause we pledge our most cordial and united support.

The Constitution was then subscribed by ten of those present, who proceeded to elect John A. Bean, President, Wm. Turner, Jas. A. Combs, E. B. Fitch, Vice Presidents, Jas. Turner, Treasurer, P. C. Fitch, Recording Secretary and S. Guthrie, Corresponding Secretary.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting, be signed by the President and Secretary, and a copy sent to the Philanthropist for publication.

JAS. TURNER, Pres't.

S. GUTHRIE, Sec'y.

HEAR THE OTHER SIDE.

The following is an extract of a letter addressed to the editor by a friend in Hudson, Lorain county, Ohio.—Ed. Phil.

"And now, my dear sir, will you permit me to present a few thoughts in regard to the prospects and duties of Abolitionists. As a man—a citizen—a christian—and a minister of the gospel, I feel a deep interest in the success of Emancipation, and have for years. Having been a member of the society, and not shunning to talk, or preach, or pray for its success, and have witnessed with gratitude its successful progress, feeling confident, with the blessing of God, of its ultimate triumph. The recent political aspect of the cause, however, excites, in me, fears—not of its enemies, but its friends. It appears to me that any effort to make the adoption of the Abolition creed, by its technical form, a test of eligibility to office, by vote of Abolitionists, must and will, result in the organization of a third party, subject to all the folly and demagogism of a political party, and will share the fate of the Anti-Masonic organization—one that was directed against an infamous institution, but not in the best manner.

No man of any party, should receive support for any office, who is so ignorant of, or so recalcitrant to, the fundamental principles of liberty, as not to advocate the right of free discussion—of petition—and theoretically and practically oppose mobs and Lynch-law.

No man can join in the popular clamor against Abolitionists, without indirectly encouraging unlawful acts—and self-respect should induce us to withhold our votes from such men.

When, however, we have advanced thus far, it becomes us to pause. The moment we demand assent to our abolition creed, as a prerequisite for securing our votes, we virtually, whether we intend it or not, declare that a correct creed on this point, is the qualification for want of which nothing will atone, and make it a test of political partisanship.

In vain do we hope to secure the votes of one party or the other, in such a case—it is hoping, that a small minority can secure, between conflicting sentiments, a majority of votes, for a member of a third party.

Now, sir, as a general rule, this can never be done. Local circumstances may effect such an occasional election, but nothing more. On the contrary, if we demand an unflinching adherence to the great principles of liberty—free discussion, right of petition, and respect for the laws, with respectful treatment from candidates, we accomplish much, and truth, under God will accomplish the rest.

Again, 90-100 of the Abolitionists sympathize in the main, with the Whigs and though they keenly feel the taint and scum of the Courier & Enquirer, Journal of Commerce, Cincinnati Whig, &c., they have nothing to hope by going over to the Administration party. Nor can they be induced to absorb themselves so wholly in this one topic, as to lose sight of others.

Any attempt, therefore, on your part, or that of others to browbeat them for an honest adherence to their political predilections, and to erect the bedstead of Procrustes, on which to square the opinions of the Abolitionists of Ohio, will only divide our ranks, and cool your friends towards the Philanthropist.

I can easily perceive, my dear sir, how easy it is for this topic, to become in your mind, one of all absorbing interest; and I can see, with equal clearness, that neither you nor any one else, can make it such in the minds of 9-10ths of the real Abolitionists.

I would therefore recommend to you, and myself, much care, caution, and kind feelings; no overstraining;—no overpressing the subject; as you would present a firm unbroken front, and gather in adherents as you press forward.

Far am I, dear sir, in writing thus, from attempting to dictate to you; but I cannot but think, that a full knowledge of the real state of feeling in this region, will lead to the adoption of the sentiment I have attempted to present before you. I hope and pray that while Providence is favoring our cause, we may not, by rash zeal, perform a suicidal act, which will only disgrace ourselves, and cause the enemies of the cause to triumph in view of our divisions.

Yours, with respect, &c."

We find no fault with the spirit of the foregoing letter, except as displayed in the paragraph, in which the editor of the Philanthropist is accused of having attempted to browbeat Abolitionists. We do not remember that we have, at any time, attempted to browbeat Abolitionists. But, while we browbeat none, we shall not be browbeaten; we never yet were amenable to threats; we cannot be intimidated from the performance of what we believe, duty, by the threat that our friends may "cool" in their regard for us. If they choose to grow cold, we cannot help it. If they at any time, feel aggrieved, they know that they can have a hearing in our columns. If they do not incline to redress their grievances in this way, they can discontinue their subscriptions. We would do much to secure their good will; but we shall never, by the blessing of God, sacrifice one jot or tittle of our independence, to please any one.—Ed. Phil.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER.

Mount Vernon, Dec. 24, 1838.

"One word in reference to the present state of our question. The general ground taken by the abolition papers, I approve, but I have been exceedingly afraid, that in their zeal to bring abolitionists up to the performance of their political duties, the moral bearings of the question would, in a measure, be lost sight of, the spirit and slang of party feelings deface their columns, and the most devout of their readers be grieved, thrown off, disheartened. The moment a man, on any set of men, advocate any cause, however noble, sacred, or holy, for party spirit, that moment they begin to labor with polluted hands; and instead of pushing the cause forward, they are hanging on weights. I verily believe that slavery can never be abolished in this country by the instrumentality of truth, until abolitionists, as a body, perform their political duty. Truth, in order to be efficient must not only be held as a theory, but it must be felt, lived out, robe its advocate day and night. But how

must abolitionists be brought up to this duty? Is it by borrowing the style, inventive, vulgar appeals, and mode of argumentation adopted by the political parties of the day? I trust not. Throw all this to the winds, or rather bury it deep, that its stench pollute not our moral atmosphere. Let abolitionists be urged to be true to their principles at the polls, by the same kind of reasoning and motives that begat in their abhorrence of slavery—truths and motives as lasting and weighty as eternity. Let them be shown that they are standing not merely in the Thermopylae of their country, but of the world.

I have mentioned this subject, not because I have seen any thing particularly objectionable in the Philanthropist, &c."

JUDGE HARPER'S DEFENCE OF SLAVERY.

(Continued.)

The slave is cut off from the means of intellectual, moral and religious improvement, and in consequence his moral character becomes depraved, and he addicted to degrading vices. The slave receives such instruction as qualifies him to discharge the duties of his particular station. The Creator did not intend that every individual human being should be highly cultivated, morally and intellectually, for as we have seen, he has imposed conditions, on society, which would render this impossible. There must be general mediocrity, or the highest cultivation must exist along with ignorance, vice and degradation.

But is there in the aggregate of society, less opportunity for intellectual and moral cultivation, on account of the existence of slavery? We must estimate institutions from their aggregate of good or evil. I refer to the views which I have before expressed to this society. It is by the existence of slavery, exempting so large a portion of our citizens from the necessity of bodily labor, that we have a greater portion than any other people, who have leisure for intellectual pursuits, and the means of attaining a liberal education. If we throw away this opportunity, we shall be morally responsible for the neglect or abuse of our advantages, and shall most unquestionably pay the penalty. But the blame will rest on ourselves, and not on the character of our institutions.

I add further, notwithstanding that equality seems to be the passion of the day, if, as Providence has evidently decreed, there can be but a certain portion of intellectual excellence in any community, it is better that it should be unequally divided. It is better that a part should be fully, and highly cultivated, and the rest utterly ignorant. To constitute a society, a variety of offices must be discharged, from those requiring but the lowest degree of intellectual power, to those requiring the very highest, and it should seem that the endowments ought to be appointed according to the exigencies of the situation. In the course of human affairs, there arise difficulties which can only be comprehended, or surmounted, by the strongest native power of intellect, strengthened by the most assiduous exercise, and enriched with the most extended knowledge;—and even these are sometimes found inadequate to the exigency. The first want of society is—leaders. Who shall estimate the value to Athens, of Solon, Aristides, Themistocles, Cymon, or Pericles? If society have not leaders qualified as I have said, they will have those who will lead them blindly to their loss and ruin. Men of no great native power of intellect, and of imperfect and superficial knowledge, are the most mischievous of all—none are so busy, meddling, confident, presumptuous, and intolerant. The whole of society receives the benefit of the exertions of a mind of extraordinary endowments. Of all communities, one of the least desirable, would be that in which imperfect, superficial, half-educated should be universal. The first care of a state which regards its own safety, prosperity and honor, should be, that when minds of extraordinary power appear, to whatever department of knowledge, art, or science, or to whatever may be directed, the means should be provided, for their most consummate cultivation. Next to this, that education should be as widely extended as possible.

Olden has been cast upon our legislation, on account of its forbidding the elements of education to be communicated to slaves. But in truth what injury is done to them by this? He who works during the day with his hands, does not read in intervals of leisure for his amusement, or the improvement of his mind—or the exceptions are so very rare, as scarcely to need the being provided for. Of the many slaves whom I have known capable of reading, I have never known one to read any thing but the Bible, and this task they imposed on themselves as matter of duty. Of all methods of religious instruction, however, this, of reading for themselves, would be the most inefficient—their comprehension is defective, and the employment is to them an unusual and laborious one.—There are but very few who do not enjoy other means, more effectual for religious instruction.—There is no place of worship opened for the white population, from which they are excluded. I believe it a mistake, to say that the instructions there given are not adapted to their comprehension, or calculated to improve them. If they are given as they ought to be—practically, and without pretension, and are such as are generally intelligible to the free part of the audience, comprehending all grades of intellectual capacity, they will not be unintelligible to slaves. I doubt whether this be not better than instruction, addressed specially to themselves—which they might look upon as a device of the master's, to make them more obedient and profitable to himself. Their minds, generally show a strong religious tendency, and they are fond of assuming the office of religious instructors to each other; and perhaps their religious notions are not much more extravagant than those of a large portion of the free population of our country. I am not sure that there is a much smaller proportion of them, than of the free population, who make some sort of religious profession. It is certainly the master's interest that they should have proper religious sentiments, and if he fails in his duty towards them, we may be sure that the consequences will be visited not upon them, but upon him.

If there were any chance of their elevating their rank and condition in society, it might be matter of hardship, that they should be debarred those rudiments of knowledge which open the way to further attainments. But this they know cannot be, and that further attainments would be useless to them. Of the evil of this, I shall speak hereafter. A knowledge of reading, writing, and the elements of arithmetic, is convenient and important to the free laborer, who is the transactor of his own affairs, and the guardian of his own interests—but of what use would they be to the slave? These alone do not elevate the mind or character, if such elevation were desirable.

If we estimate their morals according to that which should be the standard of a free man's morality, then I grant they are degraded in morals—though by no means to the extent which those who are unacquainted with the institution seem to suppose. We justly suppose, that the Creator will require of man, the performance of the duties of the station in which his providence has placed him, and the cultivation of the virtues which are adapted to their performance; that he will make allowance for all imperfections of knowledge, and the absence of the usual helps and motives which lead to self-correction and improvement. The degradation of morals relates principally to loose notions of honesty, leading to petty thefts; to falsehood and to licentious intercourse between the sexes. Though with respect even to these, I protest against the opinion which seems to be else-

where entertained, that they are universal, or that slaves, in respect to them, might not well bear a comparison with the lowest laborious class of other countries. But certainly there is much dishonesty leading to petty theft. It leads, however, to nothing else. They have no contracts or dealings which might be a temptation to fraud, nor do I know that their characters have any tendency that way.

They are restrained by the constant, vigilant, and interested superintendence which is exercised over them, from the commission of offences of greater magnitude—even if they were disposed to them—which I am satisfied they are not. Nothing is so rarely heard of, as an atrocious crime committed by a slave; especially since they have worn off the savage character which their progenitors brought with them from Africa.—Their offences are confined to petty depredations, principally for the gratification of their appetites, and these for reasons already given, are chiefly confined to the property of their owner, which is most exposed to them. They could make no use of a considerable booty, if they should obtain it. It is plain that this is a less evil to society in its consequences and example, than if committed by a freeman, who is master of his own time and actions. With reference to society then, the offence is less in itself—and may we not hope that it is less in the sight of God. A slave has no hope that by a course of integrity, he can materially elevate his condition in society, nor can his offense materially depress it, or affect his means of support, or that of his family. Compared to the free man, he has no character to establish or to lose. He has not been exercised to self-government, and being without intellectual resources, can less resist the solicitations of appetite. Theft in a freeman is a crime; in a slave, it is a vice. I recollect to have heard it said, in reference to some question of a slave's theft which was agitated in a court, "courts of justice have no more to do with a slave's stealing, than with his lying—that is a matter for the domestic forum." It was truly said—the theft of a slave is no offence against society. Compare all the evils resulting from this, with the enormous amount of vice, crime and depravity, which in an European, or one of our northern cities, disgusts the moral feelings, and render life and property insecure. So with respect to his falsehood, I have never heard or observed that slaves have any peculiar proclivity to falsehood, unless it be in denying or concealing their own offences, or those of their fellows. I have never heard of falsehood told by a slave for a malicious purpose. Lies of vanity are sometimes told, as among the weak and ignorant of other conditions. Falsehood is not attributed to an individual charged with an offence before a court of justice, who pleads not guilty—and certainly the strong temptation to escape punishment, in the highest degree extenuates, if it does not excuse, falsehood told by a slave. If the object be to screen a fellow slave, the act bears some semblance of fidelity, and perhaps truth could not be told without breach of confidence. I know not how to characterize the falsehood of a slave.

It has often been said by the denouncers of slavery, that marriage does not exist among slaves. It is difficult to understand this, unless wilful falsehood were intended. We know that marriages are contracted; may be, and often are solemnized with the forms usual among other classes of society, and often faithfully adhered to during life.—The law has not provided for making those marriages indissoluble, nor could it do so. If a man abandons his wife, being without property, and being both property themselves, he cannot be required to maintain her. If he abandons his wife, and lives in a state of concubinage with another, the law cannot punish him for bigamy. It may perhaps be meant that the chastity of wives is not protected by law from the outrages of violence. I answer, as with respect to their lives, that they are protected by manners, and their position.—Who ever heard of such outrages being offered? At least as seldom, I will venture to say, as in other communities of different forms of polity.—One reason doubtless may be, that often there is no disposition to resist. Another reason also may be, that there is little temptation to such violence, as there is so large a proportion of this class of females who set little value on chastity, and afford easy gratification to the passions of men. It might be supposed, from the representations of some writers, that a slave holding country were one wide stew for the indulgence of unbridled lust.—Particular instances of intemperance and shameless debauchery are related, which may perhaps be true, and it is left to the conscience of each man, to decide on the manner. Brutes and shameless debauchees there are in every country; we know that if such things are related as general or characteristic, the representation is false. Who would argue from the existence of a Col. Charters in England, or of some individuals who might, perhaps be named in other portions of this country, of the horrid dissoluteness of manners occasioned by the want of the institution of slavery. Yet the argument might be urged quite as fairly, and it really seems to me with a little more justice—for there such depravity is attended with much more pernicious consequences. Yet let us not deny or extenuate the truth. It is true that in this respect the morals of this class are very loose, (by no means so universally so as is often supposed,) and that the passions of men of the superior caste, tempt and find gratification in the easy chastity of the females. This is evil, and to be remedied, if we can do so, without the introduction of greater evil. But evil is incident to every condition of society, and as I have said, we have only to consider in which institution it most predominates.

Compare these prostitutes of our country, (if it is not injustice to call them so,) and their condition with those of other countries—the seventy thousand prostitutes of London, or of Paris, or the thousand of New York, or our other northern cities. Take the picture given of the first, from the author whom I have before quoted. "The laws and customs of England, conspire to sink this class of English women into a state of vice and misery, below that which necessarily belongs to their condition. Hence, their extreme degradation, their troopers' oaths, their love of gin, their desperate recklessness, and the shortness of their miserable lives."

"English women of this class, or rather girls, for few of them live to be women, die like sheep with the rot; so fast that soon there would be none left, if a fresh supply were not obtained equal to the number of deaths. But a fresh supply is always obtained without the least trouble: seduction easily keeps pace with prostitution or mortality. Those that die, are like factory children, or the poor state of the poor, by new competitors for life, instantly succeeded by others. There is no hour of a misery and death."

Though less aggravated in its features, the picture of prostitution in New York or Philadelphia would be of like character. In such communities, the unmarried woman who becomes a mother, is an outcast from society—and though sentimentalists lament the hardship of the case, it is justly and necessarily so. She is cut off from the hope of useful and profitable employment, and driven by necessity to further vice, and the hopelessness of retrieving, render her desperate, until she sinks into every depth of depravity, and is prepared for every crime that can contaminate and infect society.—She has given birth to a human being, who, if it be so unfortunate as to survive its miserable infancy, is commonly educated to a like course of vice, depravity and crime.

Compare with this the female slave under similar circumstances. She is not a less useful member of society than before. If shame be attached to her conduct, it is such shame as would be elsewhere felt for a venial impropriety. She has not impaired her means of support, or materially impaired her character, or lowered her station in society; she has done no great injury to herself, or any other human being. Her offspring is not a burden, but an acquisition to her owner; his support is provided for, and he is brought up to usefulness; if the fruit of intercourse with a freeman, his condition is, perhaps, raised, somewhat above that of his mother. Under these circumstances, with imperfect knowledge, unrestrained by the motives which operate to restrain the conduct of females elsewhere, can it be matter of surprise that she should so often yield to the temptation? Is not the evil less in itself, and in reference to society—much less in the sight of God and man? As we said of theft—the want of chastity, which among females of other countries, is sometimes vice, sometimes crime—among the free of our own, much more aggravated; among slaves, hardly deserves a harsher term than that of weakness. I have heard of complaint made by a free prostitute, of the greater countenance and indulgence shown by society towards colored persons of her profession, (always regarded as of an inferior and servile class, though individually free,) than to those of her own complexion. The former readily obtain employment; are even admitted into families, and treated with some degree of kindness and familiarity, while any approach to intercourse with the latter is shunned as contamination. The distinction is habitually made, and it is founded on the unerring instinct of nature. The colored prostitute is, in fact, a far less contaminated and depraved being. Still many, in spite of temptation, do preserve a perfectly virtuous conduct, and I imagine it hardly ever entered into the mind of one of these, that she was likely to be forced from it by authority or violence.

It may be asked, if we have no prostitutes from the free class of society among ourselves. I answer in no assignable proportion. With general truth, it might be said, that there are none. When such a case occurs, it is among the rare evils of society. And apart from other and better reasons, which we believe to exist, it is plain that it must be so, from the comparative absence of temptation. Our brothels, comparatively very few—and these should not be permitted to exist at all—are filled, for the most part, by importation from the cities of our confederate states, where slavery does not exist. In return for the benefits which they receive from our slavery, along with tariffs, libels, opinions, religious, moral, or political—they furnish us also with a supply of thieves and prostitutes. Never, but in a single instance, have I heard of an importation on the general purity of manners, among the free females of the slave holding states. Such an importation, however, made in coarse terms, we have never heard here—where divorce was never known—where no court was ever polluted by an action for criminal conversation with a wife—where it is related rather as matter of tradition, not unmingled with wonder, that a Carolinian woman of education and family, proved false to her conjugal faith—an importation deserving only of such reply as self-respect would forbid us to give, if respect for the author of it did not. And can it be doubted, that this purity is caused by, and is a compensation for the evils resulting from the existence of an enslaved class of more relaxed morals?

It is mostly the warm passions of youth, which give rise to licentious intercourse. But I do not hesitate to say, that the intercourse which takes place with enslaved females, is less depraving in its effects, than when it is carried on with females of their own caste. In the first place, as like attracts like, that which is unlike repels; and though the strength of passion be sufficient to overcome the repulsion, still the attraction is less. He feels that he is connecting himself with one of an inferior and degraded race, and that there is something of degradation in the act. The intercourse is generally casual; he does not make her habitually an associate, and is less likely to receive any taint from her habits and manners. He is less liable to those extraordinary fascinations, with which worthless women sometimes entangle their victims, to the utter destruction of all principle; worth and vigor of character. The female of his own race offers greater allurements. The haunts of vice often present a show of elegance, and various luxury tempts the senses. They are made an habitual resort, and their inmates associate, till the general character receives a taint from the corrupted atmosphere.—Not only the practice is licentious, but the understanding is sophisticated; the moral feelings are bewildered, and the boundaries of virtue and vice confused. Where such licentiousness very extensively prevails, society is rotten to the heart. But it is a small compensation for the evils attending the relations of the sexes among the enslaved class, that they have universally the opportunity of indulging the first instinct of nature, by forming matrimonial connexions? What painful restraint—what constant effort to struggle against the strongest impulses, are habitually practised elsewhere, and by other classes? And they must be practised, unless greater evils would be encountered. On the one side, all the evils of vice, with the miseries to which it leads—on the other, a marriage cursed and made hateful by want, the sufferings of children, and agonizing apprehensions concerning their future fate. Is it a small good, that the slave is free from all this? He knows that his own subsistence is secure, and that his children will be in as good a condition as himself. To a refined and intellectual nature, it may not be difficult to practise the restraint of which I have spoken. But the reasoning from the state of the great mass of mankind, is most fallacious. To these, the supply of their natural and physical wants, and the indulgence of the most part, afford the greatest good of which they are capable. To the evils which sometimes attend their matrimonial connexions, arising from their looser morality, slaves, for obvious reasons, are comparatively insensible. I am no apologist of vice, nor would I extenuate the conduct of the profligate and unfeeling, who would violate the sanctity of even these engagements, and occasion the pain which such violations no doubt do often inflict. Yet such is the truth and we cannot make it otherwise. We know, that a woman's having been before a mother, is very seldom indeed an objection to her being made a wife. I know perfectly well how this will be regarded by a class of reasoners or declaimers, as imposing a character of deeper horror on the whole system; but still, I will say, that if they are to be exposed to the evil, it is mercy that the sensibility to it should be blunted. Is it no compensation also for the vice incident to slavery, that they are, to a great degree, secured against the temptation to greater crimes and more atrocious vices, and the miseries which attend them; against their own disposition to indolence, and the profligacy which is its common result?

But if they are subject to the vices, they have also the virtues of slaves. Fidelity—often proof against all temptation, even death itself; an eminently cheerful and social temper; what the Bible imposes as a duty, but which might seem an equivocal virtue in the code of modern morality—submission to constituted authority, and a disposition to be attached to, as well as to respect those whom they are taught to regard as superiors. They may have all the knowledge which will make them useful in the station in which God has been pleased to place them, and may cultivate the virtues which will render them acceptable to him. But what has the slave of any country to do with heroic virtues,

liberal knowledge, or elegant accomplishments? It is for the master, arising out of his situation—imposed on him as duty—dangerous and disgraceful if neglected—to compensate for this, by his more assiduous cultivation of the more generous virtues, and liberal attainments.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI:

Tuesday Morning, January 8, 1839.

MR. SHINN'S COMMUNICATION, published in last week's paper, we intended to notice in some points, but want of room prevented. We hope our excellent friend will continue his communications; we are assured that they are read with much interest.

In the NEW YORK AMERICAN, we observe that the subject of delivering up fugitives from justice on executive demand is still under discussion. Two numbers more, from the same pen which gave birth to the one, republished in our columns a few weeks since, have lately appeared, in that paper. We shall avail ourselves of the first convenient opportunity to transfer them to our paper.

MR. MAHAN'S TRIAL, is now ready for sale. (See advertisement in another column.) It is a pamphlet full of deep interest, and should be circulated far and wide.

THE SPEECH OF J. C. VAUGHAN, Esq., in the case of Mahan is published in a separate form, and may be had by speedily applying at our office. It is a clear, condensed, beautiful and masterly argument on the question of jurisdiction.

ANTI-ABOLITION LECTURES.—An ex-cle-gyman, by the name of THOMAS Y. HOW, commenced a series of lectures, last week, against abolition. Our friends in New York need not be told who and what he is. Previously to the commencement of the lectures alluded to, he had been peddling out some six lectures, we believe, on Christianity, Literature, Immortality, &c. Great efforts were made to secure a large attendance on his Anti-Abolition course. He was patronized especially by a distinguished gentleman of Cincinnati, a man of great wealth and influence, who also had gained some distinction by acting as a member of the celebrated market house committee. Long advertisements were inserted in the public papers, in which it was announced that the doctrine of the American Anti-slavery society would be brought by the ex-reverend lecturer, to the test of Scripture, Justice, Philosophy, Experience, and the Constitution of the United States. Flaming hand-bills, bearing the same announcement, were widely circulated. Private influence was exerted to bring out an audience. The price of admission was made cheap—put at twenty-five cents a lecture, only twenty-five cents. Alas! for Mr. How.

Monday evening came, and with it, came thirty two people to hear the gentleman prove, that Abolitionists, in declaring slaveholding to be a crime against God, grossly labelled the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and our Lord himself. About fifteen of the thirty two were Abolitionists. The poor man did not make enough money to pay his room rent for the night. We hope "Southern brethren" will note this fact, and make up the loss, (thus disinterestedly incurred in defence of their "peculiar institution") when this eulogist of the servile relation begins his perambulations through the South. For the South, we presume, will be his next field for speculation.

Lecture second came on Thursday evening. We went to the Cincinnati College Hall, fully expecting, that the distinguished gentleman aforementioned, had beaten up for recruits, and that the chapel would of course be well-filled. But again the apologist of slavery was doomed to waste eloquent speech and graceful attitudes on bare benches. We counted thirty three hearers, most of them looking rather disconsolate, inwardly lamenting, we should guess, that people felt so little interest in turning out to see how abolitionism could be "used up." The lecturer by this time had lost his patience. He had promised to discuss the subject in a catholic and conciliatory spirit, but the sense of his own wrongs must have got the better of his good intentions. We cannot remember all the many gracious words he spoke concerning abolitionists, and if we could we would not report them. The following, however, is a part of the vocabulary of phrases and epithets, he lavished upon us:—"Audacious," "insolent," "shallow intellects," "shallow boys," "destitute of moderation, decency and common sense," "silly," "ridiculous," "gross liars," "vile slanderers," "perfect children or knaves," "stuffy themselves," "wicked," "no benevolence among them," "mad," "enthusiasts," "fanatics," "maniacs," "ignorant," "contemptible," "wild beasts," "wild boars" &c. &c. Emancipation, he declared, was a "vulgar idea, fit only for weak boys." We need not say that the lecturer demonstrated to the entire satisfaction, we suppose, of his particular friend and patron, that Abraham was a most princely slaveholder, and that Moses and his people were genuine slaveholders, after the pattern which God had shown that holy man in the mount.

But what of all this? Again this champion of what Robert Breckinridge has called sheer robbery, failed to sell enough tickets to pay his room rent. It was too bad. His disinterestedness could hold out no longer. He abruptly announced to the audience, that this was his last lecture. And yet he had but just touched the first part of his contemplated course!

On the whole, Mr. How, it was rather a poor speculation.

BIBLE SOCIETY IN TEXAS.—We learn that a Bible Society was recently formed at Houston, the capital of Texas, an agent of the American Bible Society being present. The Hon. Mr. Burnett, Vice President of the Republic, was chosen President of the Institution, and the Rev. Mr. Allen, of Houston, Corresponding Secretary. The meetings which were held in connection with this movement, are represented to have been extremely interesting. Thus the influence of the Bible keeps pace with the progress of free institutions.

What a pity the American Bible Society does not establish a branch society in the South, to supply with bibles, the millions of destitute, degraded Americans in that region.

